

## Toward the ITS-XX – a survey of needs

By Richard Rusby<sup>1</sup> and Rod White<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Physical Laboratory, Teddington TW11 0LW, UK

<sup>2</sup>Measurement Standards Laboratory, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

As promised, we have submitted to the CCT our brief summary of the Chicago Workshop ‘Toward the ITS-XX’, which was originally circulated to participants in December 2002. Looking back on the event, we feel that the discussion was useful and interesting, and a number of people expressed their appreciation of the opportunity to attend and contribute. We in turn are grateful to those who led the discussion.

However, the meeting was strongly focused (not surprisingly) on the points of ‘weakness’ of the ITS-90 and what may or may not be technically feasible to remedy them. One of the objectives of the workshop, the review of ‘needs’ for a new ITS, was only addressed to a lesser degree.

Item 8 of the Draft Agenda for the forthcoming CCT meeting is entitled ‘Discussions on ITS-20XX’, and it seems to us that the appropriate starting point would be the review of needs. By this we mean the real needs of *users* of the scale: we suppose we should not undertake a revision of the scale if it is only for the benefit of NMIs, or even of instrumentation suppliers.

We believe it would be useful to prepare for this discussion before the meeting and, with the President’s approval, we would like to initiate the discussion by asking the following two questions:

*1. What in your opinion is the most important limitation of the ITS-90 which prevents you from meeting the needs of your customers, at present or in the foreseeable future, and what is it that they are, or will be, unable to do as a result?*

and

*2. Are there other limitations in the ITS-90 which could combine to make a case for revising it? What are they, and what the consequences are for the practice of temperature measurement?*

We invite responses to these questions, or other related questions, to be sent to us at the email addresses below. If appropriate, we will collate the inputs received by the end of April and submit them for circulation.

Richard Rusby (richard.rusby@npl.co.uk)

Rod White (r.white@irl.cri.nz)